

**Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)
Advisory Committee on Problem Gambling
Program Concepts Workgroup Meeting**

July 11, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Approved (with correction) August 15, 2016

Location: Via Teleconference

Physical Location: 1820 E Sahara Avenue Suite 208, Las Vegas NV

Members Present

Stephanie Asteriadis Pyle, UNR CASAT
Ryan Gerchman, representing Veterans
Ted Hartwell, Lanie's Hope and Desert Research Institute
Jeff Marotta, Problem Gambling Solutions
Denise Quirk, Reno Problem Gambling Center
Lana Robards, New Frontier

Members Absent

Sydney Smith
Sarah St. John

Others Present

Lori Flores, The Problem Gambling Center
Pat Petrie and Gloria Sulhoff, DHHS Office of Community Partnerships and Grants (OCPG)

I. Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions and Announcements

Workgroup Chair Ted Hartwell welcomed everyone and called the meeting to order at 1:33 PM. He acknowledged the past difficulties in scheduling the meetings and thanked the members for making time to get together. Jennifer Shatley was unable to continue as Chair of the workgroup, and he was honored to pick up where she left off. Roll call was taken and a quorum was confirmed.

II. Public Comment

None

III. Approve Minutes of March 15 and April 19 Meetings

- Stephanie Asteriadis Pyle motioned to approved the minutes of the March 15, 2016 Program Concepts Workgroup meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Denise Quirk and carried unanimously.
- Ms. Pyle motioned to approve the minutes of the April 19, 2016 Program Concept Workgroup meeting as presented. The motion was seconded by Ms. Quirk and carried unanimously.

IV. Member Reports – Research on Best Practices

Mr. Hartwell stated that at the first meeting of the workgroup, members volunteered or were assigned to conduct research to be used in developing a “gold standard” of problem gambling programs for the State. This work and information will be valuable, but he suggested that the group refocus their efforts on the big picture to provide the legislature with a case for increased funding. Once additional funding is secured, the group can then determine how best to put it to use. He opened the floor to discussion and comments.

Ms. Pyle said she looked over all the information that had been provided, and what stood out to her was that other states are doing a lot more than Nevada. Some receive federal funds, and seem to be better integrated with substance abuse efforts. For instance, Ohio has a large federal substance abuse grant that includes problem gambling. She wondered if it was possible for the SAPTA and block grant applications that are written in Nevada to include problem gambling components. Even though it is not mandated, there is an effort nationally to integrate problem gambling with mental health, behavioral health, and substance abuse prevention and treatment.

Mr. Hartwell explained that he distributed the 2013 Legislative Session Talking Points document to use as a guide in developing talking points. Ms. Pyle's suggestion regarding other states' success in integrating policy and funding with the substance abuse side would be a great addition. Lana Robards agreed, adding that gambling is a big issue with clients of other publicly funded programs like marijuana registry, homeless mental health, and the chronically homeless. She suggested that Kyle Devine, Interim Bureau Chief for SAPTA (Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Agency), and Mike McMahon, with CABHI (Cooperative Agreements to Benefit Homeless Individuals), might be able to offer some direction on integrating gambling into the current reimbursement system as a non-chemical addiction.

Ms. Quirk asked about the impact on the treatment providers' relationship to DHHS if the treatment providers were to obtain a federal grant, and whether they would need to work with the Department on that. Pat Petrie responded that if the ACPG wanted to apply for any federal grants, it would have to be in conjunction with the State; however, the treatment centers could apply independently. They would need someone to track the grants and oversee the various funding streams. Ms. Robards said SAPTA and CABHI are within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health (DPBH), not under Mr. Petrie's purview. Based on their requirements, treatment centers would have to report and be accountable to DPBH as well as to DHHS OCPG. Ms. Quirk asked if there was a required level of approval for receiving federal dollars. Ms. Robards said her organization is J-Co (Joint Commission) accredited, but not every provider is nationally accredited.

Ms. Pyle clarified that she wasn't suggesting that the providers should begin applying for federal grants; her point was concerning the SAMHSA grants that Nevada currently receives. Can State agencies implement some problem gambling treatment and prevention services into future grant proposals? Ms. Robards cited SAMHSA's PATH (Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness), CABHI, and SAPTA as current funding with the potential to tap into. She volunteered to review the last joint block grant application, combining mental health and substance abuse, to see if it includes behavioral health, but added that organizations must be certified by SAPTA to receive their funding. Also, SAPTA and other State funds cannot be applied to Medicaid-eligible clients, but it doesn't hurt to have another pay source.

Ms. Pyle felt that adding problem gambling services to the State's Request for Applications (RFAs) would result in systemic change. As an example, when SAPTA stipulated that 50% of its awards would be granted to applicants utilizing evidence-based practices, everyone started implementing evidence-based practices. If the RFA includes problem gambling, people will respond and include problem gambling in their proposals to increase their chance of getting funded. If the Department could help facilitate getting even a minimal 25% of awards to include problem gambling, it would be a start.

V. Next Steps for the Workgroup

- Mr. Hartwell asked Ms. Pyle and Ms. Robards to work on a couple of bullets covering the previous discussion to run by the group at the next meeting.
- Mr. Hartwell suggested that Dr. Marotta, who had not yet called in to the meeting, might be the best resource for determining where Nevada falls in terms of overall revenue from gambling. Regarding per capita spending, his recollection was that Nevada is at 43 cents per person, and the National Council's target is one dollar per person. Ms. Quirk volunteered to reach out to Dr. Marotta on that topic and to work with him on adding bullet points on a prevalence study. She spoke with Rachel Goldberg Volberg at Gemini Research, who put the cost at about \$1.5 million. Mr. Hartwell asked if they would also brainstorm how often the study should be performed, whether every five years or as determined by a specific measure.

Dr. Marotta, phoning in late, was brought up to speed on the conversation. He added that he will be collecting data for the National Survey of Services beginning in September, so he should have data on per capita spending by state available in December.

Ms. Quirk asked Dr. Marotta what information the champion will need when bringing a bill draft to the legislature. He replied that a budget piece would not be necessary at that point. Typically, enacting legislation doesn't get into the weeds; it provides for funding, either formula based or a specific dollar amount, to be deposited into a special account to be used only for problem gambling. There are a couple different pieces when you talk about the legislative session. An informational hearing is where you present a state issue, saying we want you to be informed and consider doing something about it. The other is a bill; you find a sponsor within the Legislature who works with fiscal and legal folks to add the language. Once you have the bill draft, you then develop talking points around the bill in order to sell it. He thought the workgroup was working in reverse order, and suggested they first come up with a legislative concept, develop talking points around that concept, and then once a sponsor has been recruited, develop more defined talking points that speak precisely to the bill. The legislative workgroup decided to use a specific dollar amount with an annual Cost of Living (COL) increase, and is looking to this workgroup to determine what that amount will be, along with justification for the number. Mr. Hartwell suggested using the National Council's standard of one dollar per capita, and Dr. Marotta suggested including an increase by population growth as well as COL. Once the dollar amount has been determined, the group can develop talking points on how those dollars would be used, which would not be difficult. He suggested they start by talking about the need and identifying the gaps. He doesn't recommend going too far into explaining how the money will be used, because that might get worked into the bill, which would tie your hands on how you're able to use it. He suggested the group start by deciding whether one dollar per person is the right number.

- Mr. Hartwell thought that one dollar per capita would double the amount currently available and bring it close to the 3 million dollars that had been suggested in previous discussions. Ms. Quirk thought the number should be higher. According to Mr. Cabot, when you look at the amount of gaming money coming in and how much is going to problem gambling, it's a drop in the bucket – a fraction of a percent of the billions in revenue. Mr. Hartwell asked Dr. Marotta what other states are spending. He replied that Nevada is unique in that most gaming revenue does not come from Nevada residents. Often the justification is that if residents are losing money, then some should of that should come back. In most states, the majority of the gaming

revenue comes from their own residents, so it's not a fair comparison. Mr. Hartwell then suggested that they use the older prevalence study that they have, which shows rates are 2-5 times higher among our own residents, and our funding for that should be comparable. Dr. Marotta confirmed that those numbers exist; the operators know where the revenue is coming from, whether in-state, out-of-state, or out-of-country, but he didn't think anyone was collecting that data. Ms. Pyle mentioned the quarterly report posted on the Gaming Control Board's website, which includes all income – restricted, unrestricted, convenience stores, gas stations, and the like. Dr. Marotta thought that the revenue from those little places is probably almost all local, and volunteered to come up with some talking points around that.

- Mr. Hartwell asked everyone to send him their drafts. He will incorporate them into an updated version of the talking points and bring a draft to the next meeting. The members were reminded that in order to conform to Open Meeting Law, they should not email to the entire group or "respond to all", but they can email back and forth between each other.

VII. Schedule Next Meeting (taken out of order at discretion of the Chair)

The group decided to meet on at 1:30 PM on Monday, August 15th, prior to the ACPG meeting on the 18th. Mr. Hartwell asked the members to send their drafts to him by the end of previous week.

VI. Public Comment

Ms. Pyle asked if anyone was looking for a champion of the bill. Mr. Hartwell replied that Tony Cabot, Chair of the Legislative Workgroup, may have some ideas but as far as he knew, no one had yet been identified. Ms. Quirk added that she thought Mr. Cabot had some names but wanted substance before approaching anyone.

There was no other public comment.

VIII. Additional Announcements and Adjourn

Having concluded all business, Mr. Hartwell called for a motion to adjourn.

- Ms. Pyle motioned to adjourn the meeting. Ms. Quirk seconded and the motion carried unopposed.

Mr. Hartwell thanked the group and the meeting adjourned at 2:49 PM.